

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

RAYMOND SUN LAW OFFICES OF RAYMOND SUN 12420 WOODHALL WAY TUSTIN CA 92782

COPY MAILED

APR 2 3 2009

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of

Yu ZHENG

Application No. 10/774,281

Filed: February 06, 2004

Attorney Docket No. PAT-1536-CIP

DECISION ON PETITION

This is a decision on the renewed petition under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed January 02, 2009, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the Office action under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 11 (1935), mailed June 06, 2007, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of two (2) months. No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Accordingly, the application became abandoned on August 07, 2007.

The petition satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that petitioner has supplied (1) the reply in the form of an amendment, (2) the petition fee of \$770, and (3) a proper statement of unintentional delay. Accordingly, the reply to the office action under Ex parte Quayle of June 06, 2007 is accepted as having been unintentionally delayed.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Tredelle Jackson at (571) 272-2783.

This application is being referred to Technology Center AU 3764 for appropriate action on the concurrently filed amendment.

Ramesh Krishnamurthy

Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions

Application/Control Number: 10/774,281

Art Unit: 3764

Page 2

This application is in condition for allowance except for the following formal matters:

In claim 5, "tunnel-like" is indefinite.

Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire **TWO**MONTHS from the mailing date of this letter.

The "coiled loop" has no antecedent basis in the claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jerome Donnelly at telephone number (571) 272-4975.

Jerome Donnelly

JEROME DONNELLY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

2halos

IN THE CLAIMS:

- 1-4. (Canceled).
- 5. (Currently Amended) A structure comprising:
- a coiled wire supporting a covering which is attached to the wire to define an interior [[tunnel-like]] generally cylindrical passageway, the coiled loop and the covering having a first end and a second end;

an electronic device attached to the covering;

- a sleeve that is attached to the covering, the sleeve retaining the wire; and an electrical line retained inside the sleeve and coupled to the electronic device.
- 6. (Original) The structure of claim 5, further comprising a first tie member provided at the first end, and a second tie member provided at the second end.
- 7. (Original) The structure of claim 5, further including a lid hingedly coupled to the first end.
- 8. (Original) The structure of claim 5, further including at least one appendage attached to the covering.
 - 9. (Canceled).
- 10. (Previously Presented) The structure of claim 9, further including another electronic device attached to the sleeve.
 - 11. (Original) The structure of claim 9, further including.
- 12. (Original) The structure of claim 5, further including a power supply coupled to the electronic device.
- 13. (Original) The structure of claim 12, further including a switch coupled to the power supply and the electronic device.



IFW

PAT-1536-CIP

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

)
Art Unit: 3764

YU ZHENG
)
Serial No.: 10/774,281
)
Filing Date: February 6, 2004
)
For: Collapsible Play Structures
)

Mail Stop Petition Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

In response to the Decision on Petition dated December 12, 2008, Applicant is request reconsideration on the ground that 37 CFR 1.137(b)(1) was indeed met. In this regard, the reason given by the Office of Petitions for denying Applicant's Petition is that the required reply did not place the application in condition for allowance. However, since the Response was to a non-final Quayle Action, the Advisory Action issued by the Examiner was not proper. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the Petition has met all the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b), and that the Petition should be granted.

Respectfully Submitted,

Advision Sun Attorney for Applicant 12420 Woodhall Way Tustin, CA 92782 Tel: 949-252-9180

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Date: December 30, 2008

Æáymond Sun